



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 09/942,995 | 08/31/2001 | Kazuyoshi Tokunaga | H07-137077M/STS 9298 | |
| 21254 | 7590 03/07/2006 | | EXAMINER | |
| MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC | | | MURPHY, DILLON J | |
| 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| VIENNA, VA 22182-3817 | | | 2624 | |

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 09/942,995 | TOKUNAGA ET AL. | TOKUNAGA ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| Dillon J. Murphy | 2624 | | | |

| | Dillon J. Murphy | 2624 | | | | | |
|--|---|--|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>2/23/2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo | idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | rce, which FR 41.31; or (3) | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A | - | in the final rejection, wh | ichever is later. In | | | | |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejecti | on. | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | | | | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, | but prior to the date of filing a brief | will not be entered b | 9031150 | | | | |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | ecause | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or | | ducing or simplifying | the issues for | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | ected claims. | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co | mpliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | | | | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-22. | | ll be entered and an e | explanation of | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | ut before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidat | otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is | ot be entered s necessary and | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S | al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(| ils to provide a 1). | | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | on of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attacl | ned. | | | | |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by | ut does NOT place the application i | n condition for allowa | nce because: | | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | | |
| Thuilliana | | | | | | | |
| KIMDERLY WILLIAMS | | | | | | | |
| SUPERVICURY PATENT EXAMINER | | | | | | | |

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Continuation of 13. Other:

Regarding claim 1, applicant argues that Gasper and Zhang are not combinable, with Gasper teaching away from Zhang (Remarks, page 17, In 1-9). The examiner respectfully disagrees, citing Gasper in col 3, In 51-62, wherein the advantages and objective of the invention of Gasper is to provide an image that encodes information in a document that is invisible to a human but detectable by a machine, without degrading the quality of the document. The examiner also cites Zhang, in col 3, In 25-32, wherein Zhang provides a system and method for encoding information in a non-intrusive manner, i.e. not detectable by an observer, within a document. Both inventions are related to invisible information recording, and both Zhang and Gaper are motivated to encode information readable by only a machine without degrading the quality of the printed matter on the document.

Regarding claim 13, applicant argues on page 8, lines 1-10, that Zhang teaches encoding a print control symbol at only one predetermined location. The examiner respectfully directs the applicant to col 4, lines 53-60 of Zhang wherein print control symbols are printed at predetermined positions (i.e. a plurality of positions) separate from the informational content of the printed matter. Also see col 3, lines 50-63, wherein Zhang explicitly states that the invisible image is printed separate from any informational content on the document, i.e. the invisible image is recorded on blank locations in the document.

Regarding claims 16 and 17, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103a over Boswell, Zhang, Gasper, and Ur, applicant argues, on pages 22-24, that Ur does not teach extracting a plurality of blank areas. The examiner applies a similar reasoning as explained above in claim 13, wherein Zhang extracts a plurality of blank locations for the purpose of recording information in said blank locations.